

REMARKS

Below, the applicant's comments are preceded by related remarks of the examiner set forth in small bold font.

Claims 1-13, 15-17, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U. S. C. 103(a) as obvious over Broekhuijsen (Pat. No. 5731820) and/or the article to Bartels et al. "A Technique for the Direct Manipulation of Splines Curves" in view of Ahlquist, Jr., Pat. No. 6459439.

Considering claim 1, Broekhuijsen discloses most claimed features of the invention as set forth most in the previous action, paper no. 13. See also the Bartels et al. article at pages 33-39. Broekhuijsen and/or Bartels, however, fails to teach the step of "determining new positions for canonical locations on the Bezier shape based on predefined behaviors of the canonical locations with respect to the user-specified change in position, the positions of the canonical locations along the Bezier shape being predefined".

Ahlquist, Jr. in a similar art teaches the concept equivalent to determining (e.g., by means of a computer processor via pulling tool 23) new positions for canonical locations (e.g., segment locations along the path between points 13 and 14, see fig. 2A-H) on the Bezier shape (e.g., path 10 of fig.1) based on predefined behaviors of the canonical locations with respect to the user specified change in position, the positions of the canonical locations on the Bezier shape being predefined. See col. 5, lines 10-65.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the features of Broekhuijsen and/or Bartels to include the step of determining new position for predefined canonical locations along a Bezier shape, as taught by Ahlquist, Jr.; in order to allow the user to reshape or modify any part or area of the path. See Ahlquist, Jr. col. 3, lines 65-67.

The applicant disagrees. Claim 1 requires that the positions of the canonical locations [?] along or across the Bezier shape be "predefined" and provides that new positions be determined for the canonical locations in response to a user-specified change in position of any "arbitrary target location." Ahlquist does not disclose or suggest predefining the positions of any particular points along his Bezier spline. Even if one might imagine that the positions of some points along his spline had been predefined, no matter where those positions were located, there is at least one user-specified change in position of some arbitrary target location for which there would be no determination of new positions for the predefined points along the spline. For example, in figure 2C of Ahlquist, if the purported canonical locations had been predefined to lie between points

22a and 13 and 22b and 14, the repositioning of point 21a to 21b by the user would have produced NO change in the canonical locations and thus no change in the Bezier shape.

Therefore, whether Alquist had been taken alone or combined with Broekhuijsen and/or Bartels, it would not have made obvious the invention of claim 1.

Regarding claim 2 ...

In claim 3 ...

Re claim 4 ...

In claim 5 ...

In claim 6 ...

As per claim 7 ...

Re claim 8 ...

Regarding claim 9 ...

Re claim 10 ...

As per claim 11 ...

As per claim 12 ...

Re claim 13 ...

In claim 15 ...

Claims 2-15 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The invention of claim 16 is a medium storing machine readable instructions arrange to perform the method of claim 1, it is, therefore, subject to rejections for the same reasons and rationale set forth for claim 1.

Claim 16 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Considering claim 17, Broekhuijsen set forth most claimed features of the invention as set forth most in the previous action, paper no. 13. See also the Bartels et al. article at pages 33-39. However, Broekhuijsen and/or Bartels fails to teach the step of "determining new positions for canonical locations on the Bezier shape based on predefined behaviors of the canonical locations with respect to the user-specified change in position, the positions of the canonical locations along the Bezier shape being predefined".

Ahlquist, Jr. in a similar art teaches the concept equivalent to determining (e.g., by means of a computer processor via pulling tool 23) new positions for canonical locations (e.g., segment locations along the path between points 13 and 14, see fig. 2A-H) on the Bezier shape (e.g., path 10 of fig. 1) based on predefined behaviors of the canonical locations with respect to the userspecified change in position, the positions of the canonical locations on the Bezier shape being predefined. See col. 5, lines 10-65.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the features of Broelchuijsen and/or Bartels to include the step of determining new position for predefined canonical locations along a Bezier shape, as taught by Ahlquist, Jr.; in order to allow the user to reshape or modify any part or area of the path. See Ahlquist, Jr. col. 3, lines 65-67.

Claim 17 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The invention of claim 23, recite the underlying elements of method claim 1. As the various elements of claim 1 have been shown to be met by the combined teachings of Broekhuijsen and/or Bartels with Ahlquist Jr., it is readily apparent the method disclosed by the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such the limitations recited in claim 23 are rejected for the same reasons and rationale given above for claim 1.

Claim 23 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The invention of claim 24 recites features equivalent to and performing the same method as claim 23, it is, therefore, subject to rejections for the same reasons and rationale set forth for claim 23. Note that Broekhuijsen edits the curve implementing a cursor movement to move point 418 of 430 to point 432 which is intrinsic to dragging point 418 to a new location, i.e., point 432. See col. 17, lines 1-9.

Claim 24 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 14 ...

Claim 14 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The fact that the applicant has addressed certain positions of the examiner in this response should not be construed as a concession with respect to any other positions of the examiner. The fact that the applicants have made certain arguments for the patentability of certain claims should not be construed as a concession by the applicant that there are not other good reasons for the patentability of those claims or other claims.

The applicant asks that all claims be allowed.